#### REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed the Application in light of the Office Action dated September 17, 2010 ("Office Action"). At the time of the Office Action, Claims 1-30 were pending in the Application. The Office Action rejects Claims 1, 2, 4, 6-8, 10-19, and 21 and objects to Claims 3, 5, 9, 20, and 22-30. Applicant amends Claims 2-7, 10-15, 17-18, 20-23, and 25-30 and cancels Claims 1, 19, and 24 without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the pending claims and favorable action in this case.

## Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's indication in the *Office Action* that Claims 3, 5, 9, 20, and 22-30 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, Applicants have amended Claims 5 and 20 by rewriting them in independent form. Dependent Claims 3, 9, and 22-30 have been amended to depend from Claim 5 rather than Claim 1, which is now cancelled. Claim 19 is also cancelled. Additionally, independent Claims 12, 14, 15, 17, and 18 have been amended to incorporate claim elements that are substantially similar to those claim elements indicated to be allowable in Claim 5. At least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims should now be in condition for allowance.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.104, Applicant respectfully issues a statement commenting on the Examiner's reasons for allowance. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's reasons for allowance to the extent that they are inconsistent with applicable case law, statutes, and regulations. Furthermore, Applicant does not admit to any characterization or limitation of the claims, particularly any that are inconsistent with the language of the claims considered in their entirety and including all of their constituent limitations or to any characterization of a reference by the Examiner.

## Claim Objections

In the *Office Action*, Claim 7 is objected to because of informalities. Specifically, the Examiner indicates that the terms "system usage" in Claim 7, line 8 should be changed to "system resource usage." Additionally, the Examiner indicates that the terms "memory increases" in line 13 should be changed to "memory usage increases." Applicant has amended Claim 7 to address the issues identified by the Examiner.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to Claim 7 be withdrawn.

## Section 112, First Paragraph Rejections

In the Office Action, Claims 1, 12, 15, 17, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Specifically, the Examiner alleges that the term "a first application within the plurality of applications" contains new subject matter. (Office Action, page 3). Without conceding the veracity of the rejection of the claims on this basis and solely to advance this case to allowance, Applicant has amended Claims 12, 15, and 17 to remove the identified claim language. Claims 1 and 19 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claims 1, 12, 15, 17, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph be withdrawn.

# Section 112, Second Paragraph Rejections

In the Office Action, Claims 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards the invention. Specifically, the Examiner states that there is insufficient antecedent basis for the term "the change". (Office Action, page 3). Applicant has amended Claim 15 to address the issues identified by the Examiner.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claims 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph be withdrawn.

### Section 102 Rejections

Claims 1, 4, 6-8, 10-19, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,684,945 issued to Chen et al. ("Chen").

Without conceding the veracity of the rejection of the claims and solely to advance this case to allowance, independent Claims 1 and 19 have been cancelled. Dependent Claims 4, 6-8, 10, and 21 have been amended to depend (directly or indirectly) from now independent Claim 5, which the Examiner has identified to be allowable. Additionally, independent Claims 12, 14, 15, 17, and 18 have been amended to incorporate claim elements that are substantially similar to those claim elements indicated to be allowable in Claim 5.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of pending Claims 4, 6-8, 10-18, and 21.

### Section 103 Rejections

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Chen* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,835,765 issued to Matsumoto ("*Matsumoto*").

Without conceding the veracity of the rejection of Claim 2 and solely to advance this case to allowance, dependent Claim 2 has been amended to depend from now independent Claim 5, which the Examiner has identified to be allowable.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of pending Claim 2.

### **CONCLUSION**

Applicant has made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for immediate allowance. For the foregoing reasons and for all other reasons clear and apparent, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims.

If there are matters that can be discussed by telephone to advance prosecution of this application, Applicant invites the Examiner to contact its attorney, Jenni R. Moen, at 214-415-4820.

No fees are believed to be due, however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credits to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P. Attorneys for Applicant

Jenni R. Moen Reg. No. 52,038

Date: November 17, 2010

Correspondence Address:

at Customer No.

05073